REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated January 5, 2010. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-23. Claims 1, 10, 15, and 21 are amended. Support for claim amendments can be found in the specification as filed. See, e.g., 0007, 0009-0011. Claims 1-23 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Examiner Interview

Applicant expresses appreciation to Examiner West for conducting a personal interview on February 25, 2010 with Peter Eng, Raz Yalov, and Ori Eisen. During the interview Applicants discussed the Kermani prior art and proposed claim language for assigning a key score based on keyspaces between keys.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claims to recite assigning a score to succeeding keystrokes after k_1 based solely upon the number of keyspaces between the keys corresponding to the keystroke and to another keystroke, thereby rendering this objection moot. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in view of Kermani, U.S. Patent No. 6,895,514.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for determining the accuracy of keystroke entries of a string entered into a field by a keyboard. Claim 1 recites the step of assigning a score to succeeding keystrokes after k_1 based solely upon the number of keyspaces between the keys corresponding to the keystroke and to another keystroke. Independent claims 10, 15, and 21 recite similar limitations.

Kermani fails to teach all claim elements. Kermani discloses a system that compares "the character sequence of the just entered password as well as the keystroke timing to one or more stored password models" (col. 2, lines 43-45). Kermani does not disclose assigning a score to succeeding keystrokes after k_1 based <u>solely</u> upon the <u>number of keyspaces between the keys</u> corresponding to the keystroke and to another keystroke, as recited in claim 1. By contrast, Kermani focusing on <u>additional</u> factors, such as keystroke timing.

Since independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 21 are patentable in view of Kermani, the related dependent claims 2, 3, 7, 8, and 11, which recite additional limitations, are also patentable. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-6, 9, 16, 17, 20, and 23 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kermani, U.S. Patent No. 6,895,514 and Brown, U.S. Patent No. 5,557,686.

Brown is cited for disclosing a method to determine a similarity between samples (col. 5, lines 28-30). However, Brown does not compensate for the deficiency of Kermani. Nothing in Brown teaches or suggests assigning a score to succeeding keystrokes after k_1 based <u>solely</u> upon the <u>number of keyspaces</u> between the keys corresponding to the keystroke and to another keystroke. Instead, Brown discloses "[u]sing *timing* characteristics of the keystrokes of the collected samples based on key press times and key release times" (col. 2, lines 17-19) (emphasis added).

Because independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 21 are patentable in view of Kermani and Brown, so are related dependent claims 4-6, 9, 16, 17, 20, and 23. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 12-14, 18, 19, and 22 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kermani, U.S. Patent No. 6,895,514 and Brown, U.S. Patent No. 5,557,686 and in further view of Kroll, U.S. Patent No. 6,405,922.

Kroll is cited for disclosing that rejected signatures entered into an ATM are stored for later analysis (col. 4, lines 47-55). This reference in combination with Kermani and Brown does

not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Kroll discloses generating a keyboard signature on an ATM, which may include *duration* of key depression, keyboard *timing*, and or *time* vectors (col. 2, lines 13-19; col. 3, line 49; col. 6 lines 40-42) (emphases added). Thus, the combination of Kermani, Brown, and Kroll fails to disclose or even suggest assigning a score to succeeding keystrokes after k_1 based <u>solely</u> upon the <u>number of keyspaces</u> between the keys corresponding to the keystroke and to another keystroke.

Accordingly, Applicant contends that related dependent claims 12-14, 18, 19, and 22 are allowable, and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the remarks set forth above, Applicant believes that the present application is in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any question, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 23-2415 (Docket No. 31718-706.201).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __March 23, 2010__   By: _____

Elaine Kim, Reg. No. 57,613

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
(650) 565-3808
Client No. 021971